



JC05 Rec'd PCT/PTO # 29 MAR 2002

PATENTS

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2002

TC 700 MAIL ROOM

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

re application of

Arthur Frank BOLLEN

Serial No. 10/009,263

GROUP Unassigned

Filed December 10, 2001

Examiner Unassigned

CONTAINER

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In compliance with Rules 1.97 and 1.98, and in fulfillment of the duty of disclosure under Rule 1.56, the accompanying documents, copies of which are attached to this statement, are made of record on the enclosed sheet.

A concise explanation of the relevance of these items is that these references were cited by the Taiwan Patent Office in the corresponding Taiwanese application. A copy of the Taiwanese Official Action, in English, in which they were cited is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

By

Robert J. Patch  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 17,355  
745 South 23rd Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone: 703/521-2297

March 29, 2002



**REJECTION REASONS:**

1. The present application entitled "Container" characterized by the inclusion of: a base, a plurality of side walls and a top, at least some of the side walls having ducts therein through which gas can flow.

2. In the prior art, ducts have been provided in walls of containers for the gas flowthrough, such as Taiwan Patent No. 107093 (entitled "improved structure of cooling board") and US Patent No. 5,978,218 (entitled "cooling system for IC tester"). Furthermore, the cardboard (with flutes for gas flowthrough) used in this application is also prior art, see paragraph 2, page 7. As stated above, this application is a utilization of conventional techniques and can be easily accomplished by those skilled in the art.

3. It is also noted that (1) side wall 9, described in line 1, page 7, is not shown in the figures, and reference 9 as shown in Fig. 1 should be "base 7"; (2) apertures 72, described in line 11, page 11, are not shown in the figures; (3) subject matter "method" in Claims 26 and 27 should be added into the title.

In conclusion, based on the provisions Item 2 of Paragraph 1 of Article 20 of the Patent Law, this application is not in conformity with the satisfactory requirements of an invention.

RECEIVED  
MAR 16 2002  
U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE  
103500 MAIL ROOM

## **OUR COMMENTS**

The Examiner asserts that this application can be easily accomplished by those skilled in the art and its function is substantially the same as the citation.

We suggest stressing the differences between the prior art and this application to persuade the examiner that this application should be granted.

Please let us have your opinion on this matter.